IN THE UNITED STATES DISCTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

LOUIS PAGLIEI 4558 White Oak Lane	: CTVII ACTION
Bensalem, PA 19020	: CIVIL ACTION
·	: NO.:
Plaintiff,	:
v.	:
FEDERAL EXPRESS CORPORATION	: :
d/b/a FEDEX SHIP CENTER	:
160 Rittenhouse Circle	:
Bristol, PA 19007	: JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
Defendant.	: :

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

Louis Pagliei (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff," unless indicated otherwise) by and through his undersigned counsel, hereby avers as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff has initiated this action to redress violations by Federal Express Corporation d/b/a FedEx Ship Center (hereinafter referred to as "Defendant") of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA" – 29 U.S.C. §§ 621 et seq.), Section 1981 of the Civil Rights Act of 1866 ("Section 1981" – 42 U.S.C. § 1981), and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act ("PHRA"). As a direct consequence of Defendant's unlawful actions, Plaintiff seeks damages as set forth herein.

¹ Plaintiff's claims under the PHRA are referenced herein for notice purposes. He is required to wait 1 full year before initiating a lawsuit from the date of dual-filing with the EEOC. Plaintiff must however file his lawsuit in advance of same because of the date of issuance of his federal right-to-sue letter under the ADEA. Plaintiff's PHRA claims however will mirror identically his federal claims under the ADEA.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over the instant action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343(a)(4) because it arises under the laws of the United States and seeks redress for violations of federal laws.
- 3. This Court may properly assert personal jurisdiction over Defendant because its contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction over Defendant to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in *Int'l Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310 (1945), and its progeny.
- 4. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), venue is properly laid in this district because Defendant is deemed to reside where it is subjected to personal jurisdiction, rendering Defendant a resident of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
- 5. Plaintiff is proceeding herein under the ADEA after properly exhausting all administrative remedies with respect to such claims by timely filing a Charge of Discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") and by filing the instant lawsuit within ninety ("90") days of receiving a notice of dismissal and/or right to sue letter from the EEOC.

PARTIES

- 6. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
 - 7. Plaintiff is an adult individual with an address as set forth in the caption.
- 8. Federal Express Corporation d/b/a FedEx Ship Center is a multinational courier delivery services company with retail shipping centers located in several states in the United

States (including in Pennsylvania). Plaintiff was hired through and worked at a FedEx Ship Center located at the address as set forth in the caption.

9. At all relevant times herein, Defendant acted by and through its agents, servants and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for the Defendant.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 10. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
 - 11. Plaintiff is a 59-year-old Caucasian male.
- 12. Plaintiff worked for Defendant for approximately 30 years as a courier until his unlawful termination (as discussed *infra*) on or about December 27, 2017.
- 13. During his tenure with Defendant, Plaintiff was generally supervised by Operations Manager, Jean Ralston (hereinafter "Ralston") and Senior Manager, Ernie Ortiz (hereinafter "Ortiz").
- 14. Throughout his employment with Defendant, Plaintiff was a dedicated and hardworking employee who performed his job well.

-Age Discrimination-

- 15. Based on information and Plaintiff's observations/personal experiences, Ralston and Ortiz favored younger employees and exhibited discriminatory animus towards Plaintiff and other older employees. For example, but not intended to be an exhaustive list:
 - a. Ralston and Ortiz blatantly treated employees, including Plaintiff, who were more advanced in age, in a derogatory, demeaning, and condescending manner, including but not limited to overly scrutinizing and criticizing their work;

- b. Unlike Plaintiff's younger co-workers, Ralston and Ortiz selectively enforced policies against Plaintiff and his older co-workers;
- c. Ortiz commented multiple times to Plaintiff that Plaintiff was getting too "old" for this job and may "need to retire;"
- d. When Plaintiff questioned Ortiz about certain policies, Ortiz would say that "if [you] don't like it, just retire and leave"; and
- e. Ortiz commented several times in close proximity to Plaintiff's termination that Plaintiff "make[s] too much money for what [he] does."
- 16. Plaintiff interpreted Ortiz's repeated comments about retiring as relating to his age and perceived such comments as age discrimination.²
- 17. After observing the aforementioned instances of age discrimination and disparate treatment for months, Plaintiff was abruptly terminated by Ortiz on December 27, 2017, for an alleged custodial control rule violation (a package was stolen from Plaintiff's truck).
- 18. However, other younger employees had violated the same or similar rules during their employment with Defendant, but were not disciplined or terminated for same (even though some of those individuals committed terminable offenses).
- 19. Plaintiff was treated disparately with respect to work assignments, discipline, and termination contrary to individuals substantially younger than him.
- 20. Upon information and belief, after Plaintiff was terminated, his position was filled by a much younger and less-experienced courier named Lance Massuli.

4

² It is well recognized that any suggestion an employee "retire" constitutes objective evidence of age discrimination (let alone multiple times in an adamant manner). See, e.g., Sesso v. Mercy Suburban Hosp., 2013 WL 961625, at *4 (E.D. Pa. 2013) (explaining any suggestion that any employee retire is evidence of discriminatory animus based on age and holding such statements are sufficient if credited by a jury to find a termination based upon age discrimination).

21. Therefore, Plaintiff believes and avers the rationale given for his termination was completely pretextual and that he was really terminated because of his age.

-Racial Discrimination-

- 22. Separately and apart from the age discrimination and harassment that Plaintiff was subjected to during his employment with Defendant (discussed *supra*), Plaintiff was also subjected to discrimination based on his race.
- 23. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, he was subjected to discrimination through disparate treatment, pretextual admonishment, and termination because of his race.
- 24. Plaintiff was abruptly terminated on or about December 27, 2017, and told the purported reason for his termination was that he allegedly violated a custodial control rule (a package was stolen from his truck).
- 25. Upon information and belief, other non-Caucasian (particularly African-American/Black) employees committed the same or similar terminable offenses and were not terminated for same or were immediately re-hired through Defendant's internal grievance process. For example, a courier, Lee Jenkins (African-American/Black) was allegedly terminated for violating Defendant's anti workplace violence policy by hitting a manager; however, he was given his job back by Defendant's Vice President, Sam Nesbit (African-American/Black).
- 26. By way of further example, another courier (African-American/Black) had lost or misdelivered over 40 packages but was never disciplined or terminated for his conduct.
- 27. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that he was really terminated because of his race.

COUNT I

<u>Violation of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA")</u> (Age Discrimination – Wrongful Termination & Hostile Work Environment)

- 28. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 29. Toward the end of Plaintiff's tenure with Defendant, Defendant's management made several comments to Plaintiff about Plaintiff being to "old" and needing to retire.
- 30. Plaintiff was abruptly terminated on or about December 27, 2017, and told the purported reason for his termination was that he allegedly violated a packaging rule.
- 31. However, other younger employees had violated the same or similar rules during their employment with Defendant, but were not disciplined or terminated for same (even though some of their violations should have been terminable offenses).
- 32. Plaintiff was treated disparately with respect to work assignments, discipline, and termination contrary to individuals substantially younger than him.
- 33. Upon information and belief, after Plaintiff was terminated, his position was filled by a much younger and less-experienced courier named Lance Massuli.
- 34. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that he was subjected to a hostile work environment, and ultimately terminated from Defendant because of his advanced age.
- 35. These actions as aforesaid constitute unlawful age discrimination under the ADEA.

COUNT II <u>Violation of 42 U.S.C. Section 1981</u> (Racial Discrimination – Wrongful Termination)

36. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

- 37. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, he was subjected to discrimination through disparate treatment, pretextual admonishment, and termination because of his race.
- 38. Plaintiff was ultimately terminated from Defendants on about December 27, 2017, for completely pretextual reasons.
- 39. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that he was really terminated because of his race.
- 40. These actions as aforesaid constitute unlawful discrimination under Section 1981.

 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court enter an Order providing that:
- A. Defendant is to promulgate and adhere to a policy prohibiting discrimination in the future against any employee(s);
- B. Defendant is to compensate Plaintiff, reimburse Plaintiff, and make Plaintiff whole for any and all pay and benefits Plaintiff would have received had it not been for Defendant's illegal actions, including but not limited to back pay, front pay, salary pay increases, bonuses, insurance, benefits, training, promotions, reinstatement and seniority;
- C. Plaintiff is to be awarded liquidated and/or punitive damages as permitted by applicable law, in an amount believed by the Court or trier of fact to be appropriate to punish Defendant for its willful, deliberate, malicious and outrageous conduct and to deter Defendant or other employers from engaging in such misconduct in the future;
- D. Plaintiff is to be accorded other equitable and legal relief as the Court deems just, proper and appropriate (including but not limited to damages for emotional distress, pain, suffering and humiliation); and

E. Plaintiff is to be awarded the costs and expenses of this action and reasonable attorney's fees as provided by applicable federal and state law.

Respectfully submitted,

KARPF, KARPF & CERUTTI, P.C.

By:

Ari R. Karpf, Esq. 3331 Street Road Two Greenwood Square, Suite 128 Bensalem, PA 19020

(215) 639-0801

Dated: December 28, 2018

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

CIVIL ACTION

. Louis I agrici	• •	;		
v.		:		
Federal Express Corporation d/b/a	Fedex Ship Center	•	NO.	٠,
plaintiff shall complete a Car filing the complaint and serve side of this form.) In the e	se Management Tree a copy on all defe event that a defendable, with its first ties, a Case Mana	rack Designation and ants. (See § 1:0 lant does not agrappearance, submagement Track De	ction Plan of this court, couns Form in all civil cases at the ti 03 of the plan set forth on the re ee with the plaintiff regarding nit to the clerk of court and ser signation Form specifying the	me of verse g said ve on
SELECT ONE OF THE FO	OLLOWING CAS	SE MANAGEMI	ENT TRACKS:	
(a) Habeas Corpus - Cascs t	brought under 28 1	J.S.C. § 2241 thr	ough § 2255.	()
(b) Social Security - Cases r and Human Services den	requesting review lying plaintiff Soc	of a decision of the	ne Secretary of Health	()
(c) Arbitration - Cases requi	ired to be designat	ed for arbitration	under Local Civil Rule 53.2,	()
(d) Asbestos – Cases involvi exposure to asbestos.	ing claims for pers	sonal injury or pro	operty damage from	()
 (e) Special Management – C commonly referred to as the court. (See reverse s management cases.) 	complex and that	need special of it	ntense management by	()
(f) Standard Management -	Cases that do not	fall into any one	of the other tracks.	(X)
12/28/2018		3	Plaintiff	
Date	Attorney-at	-law	Attorney for	
(215) 639-0801	(215) 639-497	0	akarpf@karpf-law.com	
Telephone	FAX Numb	er	E-Mail Address	

(Clv. 660) 10/02

Case 2:18-cv-05602-MAK Document 1 Filed 12/28/18 Page 10 of 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DESIGNATION FORM(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff: 4558 White Oak Lane, Bensalem, PA 19020				
Address of Defendant: 160 Rittenhouse Circle, Bristol, PA 19007				
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Defendant's place of business				
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:				
Case Number: Judge: Date Terminated:				
Civil cases are deemed related when Yes is answered to any of the following questions:				
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year Yes No X previously terminated action in this court?				
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit yes No X pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?				
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court?				
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights Yes No X				
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case this court except as noted above.				
DATE: 12/28/2018 ARK2484/91538 Attorney-at-Law/Pro Se Plaintiff Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)				
CIVIL: (Place a √ in one category only)				
CIVIL: (Place a V in one category only)				
A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:				
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA				
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA				
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Antitrust 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Patent 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury 7. Civil Rights 7. Products Liability 8. Habeas Corpus 8. Products Liability 8. Products Liability 8. Products Liability 8. Products Liability Asbestos 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 9. Social Security Review Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases Please specify):				
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. FELA 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Antitrust 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Patent 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Labor-Management Relations 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Habeas Corpus 8. Products Liability 8. Products Liability 8. Products Liability 8. Products Liability 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 9. All other Diversity Cases 9. All other Diversity Cases 9. All other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability 9. Social Security Review Cases 9. All other Diversity Cases 9. All other Diversity Cases 9. All other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 9. Social Security Review Cases 9. All other Diversity Cases 9. All other Diversity Cases 9. All other Diversity Cases 9. ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (The effect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) Ari R. Karpf				
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. FELA 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Antitrust 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Civil Rights 7. Products Liability - Asbestos 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 9. All other Diversity Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): 8. Products Liability for arbitration.) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (The effect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION 1. Ari R. Karpf , counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs:				

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the

purpose of initiating the civil d	ocket sheet. <i>(SEE INSTRUC</i>	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE O	F THIS FO	RM.)		rea for the ase of the	io ciona or count i		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS					
PAGLIEI, LOUIS				FEDERAL EXPRESS CORPORATION d/b/a FEDEX SHIP CENTER					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Bucks (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
• •	Address, and Telephone Numbe	•		Attorneys (If Known	a) .				
Karpf, Karpf & Cerutti, Suite 128, Bensalem, PA						•			
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in C	ne Box Only)		FIZENSHIP OF I		AL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in On and One Box for i		
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	nt X 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		 		PTF DEF	Incorporated or Prin of Business In T	icipal Place		DEF 4
2 U.S. Government Defendant			Citize	n of Another State	2 2	Incorporated and Pri of Business In A		5	5
				n or Subject of a eign Country	3 3	Foreign Nation		6	6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box On		FO	RECTURE/PENALTY		k here for: Nature of NKRUPTCY			
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 196 Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Stander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage 385 Property Damage 70duct Liability PRISONER PETETION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	TY	Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 Other LABOR Fair Labor Standards Act Otabor/Management Relations Railway Labor Act Family and Medical Leave Act Other Labor Litigation Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application Other Immigration Actions	' 422 Apr. ' 423 With 28 PROP! 820 Cop. 830 Pate 840 Trac 861 HIA 4 863 DIW 864 SSI ' 865 RSI (FEDER 870 Tax or I 871 IRS 261	peal 28 USC 158 hdrawal USC 157 ERTYRIGHTS syrights ent ent - Abbreviated v Drug Application lemark LESECURITY (1395ff) ek Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) D Title XVI	0 375 False Clair ' 376 Qui Tam (3 3729(a)) 0 400 State Reapp	ms Act 1 USC Dortionment Banking influenced ganizations Credit IV Commoditi Acts out I Acts out I Matter finformati tive Procee w or Appea	and s sies/
	moved from 0 3 ate Court	Appellate Court	J 4 Reins Reop	ened Anoth (speci)		I 6 Multidistr Litigation Transfer	ı- L	fultidistri itigation irect File	-
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	N ADEA (29USC6) Brief description of ca	atute under which you ar 21); Section 1981 (ause: ADEA, Section 19	42USC6	21)	ututes unless di	versity):	····		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION		EMAND S		CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:		mplaint: 'No	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCK	ET NUMBER			
12/28/2018		SIGNATURE OF AT	ORNEY O	FRECORD					-
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AM	AOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUE	OGE		
RECEIFT# AN	MOON1	APPLIINGIPP				IMAG. JUL	,		

Reset

Save As...

Print